

O

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION

BARRY S. JAMESON,)	No. CV 09-09398-CAS (VBK)
)	
Petitioner,)	ORDER (1) ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING
)	THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF
v.)	THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
)	JUDGE, AND (2) DISMISSING THE
MATTHEW CATE,)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
)	CORPUS
Respondent.)	
_____)	

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has made a de novo review of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, Petitioner's Opposition, all of the records herein and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge ("Report").

//

//

//

//

//

//

1 **IT IS ORDERED** that: (1) the Court accepts and adopts the Report
 2 and Recommendation, (2) the Court declines to issue a Certificate of
 3 Appealability ("COA");¹ (3) Respondent's Motion to Dismiss is granted;
 4 and (3) Judgment is entered denying and dismissing the Petition with
 5 prejudice.

6 

7 DATED: April 7, 2011

8

CHRISTINA A. SNYDER
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20

21 ¹ Under 28 U.S.C. §2253(c)(2), a COA may issue "only if the
 22 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a
 23 constitutional right." The Supreme Court has held that, to obtain a
 24 Certificate of Appealability under §2253(c), a habeas petitioner must
 25 show that "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that
 26 matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a
 27 different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to
 28 deserve encouragement to proceed further'." Slack v. McDaniel, 529
 U.S. 473, 483-84, 120 S.Ct. 1595 (2000)(internal quotation marks
 omitted); see also Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336, 123 S.Ct.
 1029 (2003). After review of Petitioner's contentions herein, this
 Court concludes that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of
 the denial of a constitutional right, as is required to support the
 issuance of a COA.